arXiv:1401.7946v2 [math.AG] 15 Jan 2015

COMPARING MULTIPLIER IDEALS TO TEST IDEALS ON NUMERICALLY $\mathbb{Q}$-GORENSTEIN VARIETIES

TOMMASO DE FERNEX, ROI DOCAMPO, SHUNSUKE TAKAGI, AND KEVIN TUCKER

Abstract. We show that the reduction to positive characteristic of the multiplier ideal in the sense of de Fernex and Hacon agrees with the test ideal for infinitely many primes, assuming that the variety is numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein. It follows, in particular, that this reduction property holds in dimension 2 for all normal surfaces.

Introduction

It has been understood for a while now that there is a connection between the theory of multiplier ideals in characteristic zero and the theory of test ideals in positive characteristic (cf. [Smi00, Har01, Tak04, MS11, BST]). But one of the puzzling features of this connection is its asymmetry: test ideals are defined for arbitrary varieties, but multiplier ideals are only defined after imposing some conditions on the singularities (namely one requires the variety to be (log) $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein). It is therefore natural to wonder if there are extensions of the theory of multiplier ideals beyond the $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein case, and what could be their relation to test ideals. One such possible generalization has been proposed in [dFH09], where only normality is assumed to define the multiplier ideal. This theory is still largely unexplored, and few tools are available for its study.

In [BdFF12, BdFFU], the authors introduce and study a new class of singularities, called *numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein* singularities, which encompasses the class of $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein singularities. It turns out that the theory of multiplier ideals on normal varieties, as introduced in [dFH09], becomes particularly simple on numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein varieties. One key feature is that while on arbitrary normal varieties the definition of multiplier ideals requires an asymptotic construction which involves infinitely many resolutions, multiplier ideals on numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein varieties can always be computed from one resolution of singularities, just like in the $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein case.

The purpose of this note is the following theorem, where multiplier ideals in the sense of [dFH09] are related to test ideals assuming the variety is numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein.

Theorem 1. *Let X be a numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein variety over an uncountable algebraically closed field k of characteristic 0, and let Z be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X. Given a model of (X, Z) over a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}$-subalgebra A of k, there exists a dense open*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 14F18, 13A35; Secondary: 14B05.

Key words and phrases. Multiplier ideal, test ideal.

The first author was partially supported by NSF CAREER grant DMS-0847059, NSF FRG Grant DMS-1265285, and a Simons Fellowship. The second author was partially supported by CNPq/Ciência Sem Fronteiras, under the program Atração de Jovens Talentos, Processo 370329/2013–9. The third author was partially supported by Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) 23740024 from JSPS. The fourth author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1419448.

Compiled on January 19, 2015. Filename `num-Gor-14-1205`.

subset $S \subseteq \operatorname{Spec} A$ such that for all closed points $\mu \in S$,

$$\mathcal{J}(X, Z)_\mu = \tau(X_\mu, Z_\mu).$$

Here $\mathcal{J}(X, Z)$ denotes the multiplier ideal of the pair (X, Z) in the sense of [dFH09]*, and $\tau(X_\mu, Z_\mu)$ is the (big) test ideal of the pair (X_μ, Z_μ).*

Since every normal surface is numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein (cf. [BdFF12, Example 2.29]), the theorem applies, in particular, to all pairs (X, Z) where X is any normal surface and Z is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X.

Theorem 1 is an extension of the results on (log) $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein varieties [Smi00, Har01, Tak04]. It remains open, at the moment, whether the same property holds on all normal varieties (this question is considered for instance in [Sch11, Remark 6.2]). We hope that our theorem, apart from bringing evidence to this, will also show that numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein varieties provide a natural framework for the theory of singularities of pairs.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 1 we review the theories of multiplier ideals in the sense of [dFH09] and of numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein singularities. In section 2 we discuss the theory of test ideals and the previously known relations to multiplier ideals. In section 3, we give the proof Theorem 1. In the last section, we briefly discuss the numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein condition in positive characteristics and ask some natural open questions.

Acknowledgments. This paper is the result of a project started during the AIM workshop "Relating test ideals and multiplier ideals," Palo Alto, August 8–12, 2011.

1. Multiplier ideals

Consider a pair (X, Z), where X is a normal variety, defined over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic 0, and Z is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X. The normality of X guarantees the existence of canonical divisors K_X on X.

The classical way of associating a multiplier ideal to (X, Z) assumes that K_X is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier (the $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein condition) or, more generally, that we fix an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor Δ such that $K_X + \Delta$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier. Then we consider a log resolution $\pi\colon Y \to X$ of $((X, \Delta), Z)$ and pick canonical divisors K_X on X and K_Y on Y in a compatible way: $\pi_* K_Y = K_X$.

Definition 2. The sheaf of ideals

$$\mathcal{J}((X, \Delta), Z) := \pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(\lceil K_Y - \pi^*(K_X + \Delta + Z)\rceil)$$

is called the *multiplier ideal* of $((X, \Delta), Z)$. When X is $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein we write $\mathcal{J}(X, Z)$ instead of $\mathcal{J}((X, 0), Z)$.

In [dFH09] a multiplier ideal is defined without using an auxiliary boundary Δ. For this, consider log resolutions $\pi_m\colon Y_m \to X$ of (X, Z) with the following extra conditions: the inverse image of the fractional ideal $\mathcal{O}_X(-mK_X)$ is of the form

$$\mathcal{O}_X(-mK_X) \cdot \mathcal{O}_{Y_m} = \mathcal{O}_Y(-f^\sharp(mK_X)),$$

for some Cartier divisor $f^\sharp(mK_X)$ on Y_m with simple normal crossings with $\operatorname{Ex}(\pi_m) \cup \operatorname{Supp}(\pi_m^* Z)$. After picking canonical divisors K_{Y_m} and K_X with $\pi_* K_{Y_m} = K_X$, we define

$$K_{m, Y_m/X} := K_{Y_m} - \tfrac{1}{m} f^\sharp(mK_X).$$

Definition 3. The sheaf of ideals

$$\mathcal{J}_m(X, Z) := \pi_{m*} \mathcal{O}_{Y_m}(\lceil K_{m, Y_m/X} - \pi^* Z\rceil)$$

is called the *m-limiting multiplier ideal* of (X, Z). The *multiplier ideal* $\mathcal{J}(X, Z)$ of the pair (X, Z) is the maximal element of the set of m-limiting multiplier ideals:

$$\mathcal{J}(X, Z) := \mathcal{J}_{m_0}(X, Z) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{J}_m(X, Z),$$

where m_0 is sufficiently divisible (the condition on divisibility depends both on X and Z).

If K_X is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, then the sequence of m-limiting multiplier ideals stabilizes to the classical $\mathcal{J}(X, Z)$ as soon as m is divisible by the Cartier index of K_X, and in particular both definitions of $\mathcal{J}(X, Z)$ agree in this case. The following result relates the two notions in general.

Theorem 4 ([dFH09, Theorem 1.1])**.** *The multiplier ideal $\mathcal{J}(X, Z)$ is the unique maximal element of the set of multiplier ideals $\mathcal{J}((X, \Delta), Z)$ where Δ varies among all effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors such that $K_X + \Delta$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier. In particular, there is one such Δ_0 such that*

$$\mathcal{J}(X, Z) = \mathcal{J}((X, \Delta_0), Z) = \sum_{\Delta} \mathcal{J}((X, \Delta), Z).$$

In general it is not clear how to detect when the sequence of m-limiting multiplier ideals stabilizes. A priori, one might need to take into account infinitely many resolutions to determine that we have computed $\mathcal{J}(X, Z)$. The condition of *numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein* singularities, introduced and studied in [BdFF12, BdFFU], is designed to provide a work-around for this issue.[1]

Definition 5. A (Weil) divisor D on a normal variety X is said to be *numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier* if for some (equivalently any) resolution of singularities $\pi\colon Y \to X$, there is a ($\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier) $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D' on Y that is π-numerically trivial (that is, it has zero intersection with all π-exceptional curves on Y) and satisfies $D = \pi_* D'$. When D is numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, the $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D' as above is uniquely determined for each resolution Y. We denote it $\pi^*_{\mathrm{num}} D$ and call it the *numerical pull-back* of D to Y.

Definition 6. When K_X is numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, then we say that X is *numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein*. In this case, given a resolution $\pi\colon Y \to X$, and canonical divisors K_Y and K_X with $\pi_* K_Y = K_X$, we define

$$K^{\mathrm{num}}_{Y/X} := K_Y - \pi^*_{\mathrm{num}} K_X.$$

In the case of surfaces, the notion of numerical pull-back was introduced by Mumford. In fact, it follows from the Negativity Lemma that all divisors on normal surfaces are numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, and in particular all normal surfaces are numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein.

Another useful example to keep in mind in order to compare this notion with the more common notion of $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein singularities is the case of cones. Suppose X is the cone over a projective manifold V polarized by a projectively normal divisor L (so that X is normal). Then X is $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein (resp., numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein) if and only if L is $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly proportional (resp., numerically proportional) to K_V (cf. [BdFF12, Lemma 2.32]).

The main reason the notion of numerical $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein singularities is useful in the context of multiplier ideals is the following result.

[1] The definitions of *numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier* and *numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein* given here follow [BdFFU]; they are equivalent to the definitions of *numerically Cartier* and *numerically Gorenstein* given in [BdFF12].

Theorem 7 ([BdFFU, Theorem 1.3])**.** *Assume that X is numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein. For every log resolution $\pi\colon Y \to X$ of (X, Z), we have*

$$\mathcal{J}(X, Z) = \pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(\lceil K^{\mathrm{num}}_{Y/X} - \pi^* Z \rceil).$$

2. Test ideals

A field k of characteristic $p > 0$ is said to be *F-finite* if $[k : k^p] < \infty$. Let V be a normal variety defined over an F-finite field of characteristic $p > 0$, and let W be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on V. Let $F^e : V \to V$ denote the e^{th} iteration of the absolute Frobenius morphism.

Definition 8. We define the *test ideal*[2] $\tau(V, W)$ of the pair (V, W) to be the smallest nonzero ideal sheaf $J \subseteq \mathcal{O}_V$ which locally satisfies the following condition: for every $e \geq 0$ and every map $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_V}(F^e_* \mathcal{O}_V(\lceil (p^e - 1)W \rceil), \mathcal{O}_V)$, we have

$$\phi\big(F^e_* J\big) \subseteq J.$$

Theorem 9 ([Sch11, Corollary 5.2])**.** *Suppose that W is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on V. Then we have*

$$\tau(V, W) = \sum_{\Gamma} \tau(V, \Gamma + W)$$

where the sum runs over all effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors Γ on V such that $K_V + \Gamma$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier.

We now recall how test ideals behave under reduction to characteristic zero. We refer to the sources [MS11, Section 2.2] and [HH99] for a detailed description of the process of reduction to characteristic zero.

Let X be a normal scheme of finite type over a field k of characteristic zero and $Z \subsetneq X$ be a closed subscheme. Choosing a suitable finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}$-subalgebra A of k, we can construct a scheme X_A of finite type over A and closed subschemes $Z_A \subsetneq X_A$ such that $(Z_A \hookrightarrow X_A) \otimes_A k \cong (Z \hookrightarrow X)$. We can enlarge A by localizing at a single nonzero element and replacing X_A and Z_A with the corresponding open subschemes. Thus, applying generic freeness [HH99, (2.1.4)], we may assume that X_A and Z_A are flat over $\operatorname{Spec} A$. We refer to (X_A, Z_A) as a *model* of (X, Z) over A. If Z is a prime divisor on X, then possibly enlarging A, we may assume that Z_A is a prime divisor on X_A. When $D = \sum_i d_i D_i$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X, let $D_A := \sum_i d_i D_{i,A}$.

Given a closed point $\mu \in \operatorname{Spec} A$, we denote by X_μ (resp. Z_μ, $D_{i,\mu}$) the fiber of X_A (resp. Z_A, $D_{i,A}$) over μ and denote $D_\mu := \sum_i d_i D_{i,\mu}$. Then X_μ is a scheme of finite type over the residue field $\kappa(\mu)$ of μ, which is a finite field of characteristic $p(\mu)$. After enlarging A if necessarily, X_μ is normal, the $D_{i,\mu}$ are prime divisors, and D_μ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X_μ for all closed points $\mu \in \operatorname{Spec} A$.

Question 10. Let X be a normal variety over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic 0 and Z be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X. Suppose we are given a model of (X, Z) over a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}$-subalgebra A of k. Then does there exist a dense open subset $S \subseteq \operatorname{Spec} A$ such that

$$\mathcal{J}(X, Z)_\mu = \tau(X_\mu, Z_\mu)$$

for every closed point $\mu \in S$?

When K_X is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, this property was established by Smith and Hara [Smi00, Har01]. Their result was extended to all log pairs by Takagi, who proved the following result.

[2] It has been traditionally called in the literature the *big* (or *non-finitistic*) *test ideal*.

Theorem 11 ([Tak04, Theorem 3.2])**.** *With the above notation, suppose that Δ is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X such that $K_X + \Delta$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier. Given a model of (X, Δ, Z) over a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}$-subalgebra A of k, there exists a dense open subset S of* $\operatorname{Spec} A$ *such that for all closed points $\mu \in S$,*

$$\mathcal{J}((X, \Delta), Z)_\mu = \tau(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu + Z_\mu).$$

Question 10 remains in open in general. Theorem 1 settles the question when K_X is numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier

Remark 12. In the setting of Theorem 9, it is an open question whether $\tau(V, W)$ is actually equal to $\tau(V, \Gamma + W)$ for some effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor Γ such that $K_V + \Gamma$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier. Furthermore, suppose $V = X_\mu$ is a general closed fiber of a deformation $X_A \to \operatorname{Spec} A$, where X is a normal variety defined over a field of characteristic 0 and A is a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}$-subalgebra of k. Similarly, suppose $W = Z_\mu$ is obtained from an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor Z on X. If we assume that there exists an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor Γ on V such that $\tau(X_\mu, Z_\mu) = \tau(X_\mu, \Gamma + Z_\mu)$, it is also an open question whether such Γ could be reduced from characteristic 0 (cf. [Sch11, Question 6.3]).

3. Proof of the theorem

As in Theorem 1, let X be a numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein variety over an uncountable algebraically closed field k of characteristic 0, and let Z be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X. Suppose we are given a model of (X, Z) over a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}$-subalgebra A of k. Let $\pi\colon Y \to X$ be a fixed projective log resolution of (X, Z). After possibly enlarging A, we may assume that we have a model of π over A, and that π_μ is a projective log resolution of (X_μ, Z_μ) for all closed points $\mu \in \operatorname{Spec} A$.

It follows from Theorem 4 that

$$\mathcal{J}(X, Z) = \mathcal{J}((X, \Delta), Z)$$

for some effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor Δ on X such that $K_X + \Delta$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier. Enlarging A if necessary, we may assume that a model of Δ over A is given, $K_{X_\mu} + \Delta_\mu$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier and

$$\mathcal{J}(X, Z)_\mu = \mathcal{J}((X, \Delta), Z)_\mu$$

for all closed points $\mu \in \operatorname{Spec} A$. By Theorem 11, after possibly enlarging A, we may assume that

$$\mathcal{J}((X, \Delta), Z)_\mu = \tau(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu + Z_\mu)$$

for all closed points $\mu \in \operatorname{Spec} A$. Then, since by Theorem 9 we have

$$\tau(X_\mu, Z_\mu) = \sum_\Gamma \tau(X_\mu, \Gamma + Z_\mu),$$

where the sum runs over all effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors Γ on X_μ such that $K_{X_\mu} + \Gamma$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, we obtain

$$\mathcal{J}(X, Z)_\mu \subseteq \tau(X_\mu, Z_\mu)$$

for all closed points $\mu \in \operatorname{Spec} A$.

To finish the proof, we need to show that the reverse inclusion

$$\tau(X_\mu, Z_\mu) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(X, Z)_\mu \tag{3.1}$$

also holds for almost all $\mu \in \operatorname{Spec} A$. It suffices to show that there exists a dense open subset $S \subseteq \operatorname{Spec} A$ such that for every closed point $\mu \in S$ and every effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor Γ on X_μ such that $K_{X_\mu} + \Gamma$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, one has

$$\tau(X_\mu, \Gamma + Z_\mu) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(X, Z)_\mu.$$

On the one hand, by [Tak04, Theorem 2.13] (see also [BST]) there is always an inclusion

$$\tau(X_\mu, \Gamma + Z_\mu) \subseteq \pi_{\mu *}\mathcal{O}_{Y_\mu}(\lceil K_{Y_\mu} - \pi_\mu^*(K_{X_\mu} + \Gamma + Z_\mu)\rceil).$$

Since by Theorem 7 we have

$$\mathcal{J}(X, Z) = \pi_*\mathcal{O}_Y(\lceil K^{\mathrm{num}}_{Y/X} - \pi^* Z\rceil),$$

after possibly enlarging A, we may assume that

$$\mathcal{J}(X, Z)_\mu = \pi_{\mu *}\mathcal{O}_{Y_\mu}(\lceil (K^{\mathrm{num}}_{Y/X})_\mu - \pi_\mu^* Z_\mu\rceil)$$

for all closed points $\mu \in \operatorname{Spec} A$. Therefore, the proof of the theorem is complete once we establish the following property.

Proposition 13. *There exists a dense open subset $S \subset \operatorname{Spec} A$ such that for every closed point $\mu \in S$,*

$$K_{Y_\mu} - \pi_\mu^*(K_{X_\mu} + \Gamma) \leq (K^{\mathrm{num}}_{Y/X})_\mu.$$

The proof of the proposition uses the Negativity Lemma (cf. [KM98, Lemma 3.39]) in the following more precise formulation. We say that an irreducible projective curve C in a variety X is *movable in codimension 1* if it belongs to an irreducible family of curves whose locus in X is dense in a codimension 1 subset of X.

Lemma 14. *Let $\pi\colon Y \to X$ be a projective resolution of a normal variety over an uncountable algebraically closed field of characteristic 0, and assume that the exceptional locus of π has pure codimension 1. Then there are finitely many irreducible curves $C_1, \dots, C_s$ in Y such that*

(a) *each C_j is π-exceptional and movable in codimension 1, and*
(b) *for every divisor D on Y, if $D \cdot C_j \geq 0$ for all j and $\pi_* D \leq 0$, then $D \leq 0$.*

Proof of Proposition 13. Let $E_1, \dots, E_t$ be the prime exceptional divisors of $\pi\colon Y \to X$, and let $C_1, \dots, C_s$ be the irreducible curves on Y satisfying the properties listed in Lemma 14.

By possibly enlarging A, we can assume that $E_{1,\mu}, \dots, E_{t,\mu}$ are the prime exceptional divisors of $\pi_\mu\colon Y_\mu \to X_\mu$, and that $C_{1,\mu}, \dots, C_{s,\mu}$ are π_μ-exceptional and movable in codimension 1. Furthermore, we assume that the reduction is such that $E_{i,\mu} \cdot C_{j,\mu} = E_i \cdot C_j$ and $K_{Y_\mu} \cdot C_{j,\mu} = K_Y \cdot C_j$ for all i, j and all μ.

Fix $\mu \in \operatorname{Spec} A$. We consider the $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor

$$F_\mu := K_{Y_\mu} - \pi_\mu^*(K_{X_\mu} + \Gamma) - (K^{\mathrm{num}}_{Y/X})_\mu + (\pi_\mu)_*^{-1}\Gamma,$$

where Γ is an arbitrary effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor such that $K_{Y_\mu} + \Gamma$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier. We need to show that F_μ is anti-effective. Since it is exceptional, we can write

$$F_\mu = \sum a_i E_{i,\mu}.$$

Then F_μ lifts to characteristic 0, as it is the reduction of the divisor

$$F = \sum a_i E_i.$$

So it suffices to check that $F \leq 0$. To this end, by Lemma 14 we only need to check that $F \cdot C_j \geq 0$ for all j.

Note that $\pi_\mu^*(K_{X_\mu}+\Gamma)\cdot C_{j,\mu}=0$ since $\pi_\mu^*(K_{X_\mu}+\Gamma)$ is π_μ-numerically trivial. Moreover, since $C_{i,\mu}$ is π_μ-exceptional and movable in codimension 1, and $(\pi_\mu)_*^{-1}\Gamma$ does not contain any π_μ-exceptional component, we have that $(\pi_\mu)_*^{-1}\Gamma\cdot C_{j,\mu}\geq 0$. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} F\cdot C_j &= F_\mu\cdot C_{j,\mu}\\ &\geq (K_{Y_\mu}-(K^{\mathrm{num}}_{Y/X})_\mu)\cdot C_{j,\mu}\\ &= (K_Y-K^{\mathrm{num}}_{Y/X})_\mu\cdot C_{j,\mu}\\ &= (K_Y-K^{\mathrm{num}}_{Y/X})\cdot C_j\\ &= (\pi^*_{\mathrm{num}}K_X)\cdot C_j\\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from the fact that $\pi^*_{\mathrm{num}}K_X$ is, by definition, π-numerically trivial, and that C_j is π-exceptional. □

Proof of Lemma 14. Our goal is to reduce to the usual Negativity Lemma for surfaces (essentially the Hodge Index Theorem, see [KM98, Lemmas 3.40, 3.41]). The idea is that we can check for anti-effectivity of a divisor $D\subset Y$ by considering its restrictions $D|_T$, where $T\subset Y$ is a subsurface. But $D|_T$ will be anti-effective if intersects non-negatively with the π-exceptional curves of T. The problem is that in principle one might need to use a different T depending on the divisor D, and we are lead to an infinite family of curves. The main observation is that, given an integer e, it is possible to use the same T for all divisors D whose irreducible components have image in X of codimension e.

In more detail, we proceed as follows. First we assume that X is quasi-projective, which is allowed because the problem is local with respect to X. Let $n\geq 3$ be the dimension of X. We fix very general hyperplane sections $L_3,\dots,L_n$ in X, and $H_3,\dots,H_n$ in Y. For every $e=2,3,\dots,n$ we consider the surface $T_e\subset Y$ given by

$$T_e=(H_3\cap\cdots\cap H_e)\cap\pi^{-1}(L_{e+1}\cap\cdots\cap L_n).$$

Notice that T_e is smooth. We let S_e be the normalization of $\pi(T_e)$, and $\pi_e\colon T_e\to S_e$ the map induced by π. The exceptional locus of π_e consists of finitely many curves, which we denote $C_{e,1},\dots,C_{e,m_e}$. We will show that the finite set of curves

$$\{\ C_{e,j}\ \mid\ e=2,3,\dots,n,\quad j=1,2,\dots,m_e\ \}$$

has the properties required by the lemma.

Since T_e is cut out by very general members in base-point free linear systems, each of these curves $C_{e,j}$ is movable in codimension 1 inside X, and part (a) of the lemma holds. To prove part (b), we need more information on how these curves $C_{e,j}$ intersect the irreducible components of the exceptional locus of π.

Let E be an exceptional prime divisor, and let

$$B:=\pi(E)\cap L_{e+1}\cap\cdots\cap L_n.$$

Note that

$$T_e\cap E=H_3\cap\cdots\cap H_e\cap(\pi|_E)^{-1}(B),$$

where $\pi|_E\colon E\to X$ is the restriction of π to E. Note also that $T_e\cap E$, if nonempty, has pure dimension 1. Denoting by c the codimension of $\pi(E)$ in X, we have the following cases:

(i) If $c>e$, then B is empty and E is disjoint from T_e. In particular, $E\cdot C_{e,j}=0$ for all j.

(ii) If $c = e$, then B is zero-dimensional and $(\pi|_E)^{-1}(B)$ is a union of general fibers of $\pi|_E$. In particular, $T_e \cap E$ is nonempty and each irreducible component is equal to $C_{e,j}$ for some j.

(iii) If $c < e$, then B is an irreducible set of positive dimension, and $(\pi|_E)^{-1}(B)$ is irreducible as well. Then $T_e \cap E$ is an irreducible curve and is not π-exceptional. In particular, E does not contain $C_{e,j}$ for any j, and hence $E \cdot C_{e,j} \geq 0$ for all j.

We now prove part (b) of the lemma. Suppose D is a divisor on Y such that $\pi_* D \leq 0$ and $D \cdot C_{e,j} \geq 0$ for all e, j. Write $D = D_1 + \cdots + D_n$ where each D_e is supported exactly on the irreducible components of D whose image in X has codimension e. We claim that $D_e \leq 0$ for every e. We prove this by induction on e. For $e = 1$, this is the condition that $\pi_* D \leq 0$.

Assume $e > 1$. By (ii), T_e intersects properly every component of D_e, and if E is irreducible component of D_e then $T_e \cap E$ is a general complete intersection in $(\pi|_E)^{-1}(B)$. If E' is a different irreducible component of D_e, and $B' := \pi(E') \cap L_{e+1} \cap \cdots \cap L_n$, then $(\pi|_E)^{-1}(B)$ and $(\pi|_{E'})^{-1}(B')$ do not have any components in common, since the hyperplane sections $L_{e+1}, \ldots, L_n$ are general. It follows that the restrictions $E|_{T_e}$ and $E'|_{T_e}$ share no common components. Therefore it is enough to show that $D_e|_{T_e} \leq 0$. Again by (ii), we see that the irreducible components of $D_e|_{T_e}$ are of the form $C_{e,j}$ for some j (that is, $D_e|_{T_e}$ is π_e-exceptional). In particular, using the Negativity Lemma for surfaces, it is enough to show that $D_e|_{T_e} \cdot C_{e,j} \geq 0$ for all j. Since, by (i), $D_{e'} \cdot C_{e,j} = 0$ whenever $e' > e$, we have that

$$D \cdot C_{e,j} = (D_1 + \cdots + D_e) \cdot C_{e,j} = (D_1 + \cdots + D_{e-1}) \cdot C_{e,j} + D_e \cdot C_{e,j}.$$

By induction we know that $D_1 \leq 0, \ldots, D_{e-1} \leq 0$, and we know by (iii) that $C_{e,j}$ is not contained in the support of $D_2 + \cdots + D_{e-1}$. Moreover, $C_{e,j}$ is movable in codimension 1 and since it is π-exceptional, the locus spanned by its deformations is π-exceptional. This implies that the intersection of $C_{e,j}$ with each of the components of D_1 is non-negative. Therefore we see that $(D_1 + \cdots + D_{e-1}) \cdot C_{e,j} \leq 0$. By hypothesis we know that $D \cdot C_{e,j} \geq 0$, so we must have that $D_e|_{T_e} \cdot C_{e,j} = D_e \cdot C_{e,j} \geq 0$, as required. □

4. Some open questions

The notion of a numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor given above and studied in [BdFF12, BdFFU] is, at first glance, particular to characteristic zero where resolutions of singularities are known to exist. However, in arbitrary characteristic, one may just as well make use of the regular alterations provided by [dJ96]. Recall that a regular alteration of a variety X is a proper surjective morphism $\pi\colon Y \to X$ where Y is regular and $\dim Y = \dim X$. We extend Definition 5 to all characteristics as follows.

Definition 15. A (Weil) divisor D on a normal variety X over an algebraically closed field is said to be *numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier* if, for some regular alteration $\pi\colon Y \to X$, there is a ($\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier) $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D' on Y that is π-numerically trivial (that is, it has zero intersection with all π-exceptional curves on Y) and satisfies $D = \pi_* D'$. When D is numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, we denote D' by $\pi^*_{\mathrm{num}} D$ and call it the *numerical pull-back* of D to Y.

The fact that D' in the definition is uniquely determined by the given conditions follows by the Negativity Lemma [KM98, Lemma 3.39] applied to the Stein factorization of π. Since the pull-back of a Cartier divisor to a dominating regular alteration remains relatively numerically trivial, the existence of a numerical pull-back of D to an arbitrary regular alteration follows exactly as in [BdFFU, Proposition 5.3], and one can replace π by an arbitrary regular alteration in the definition. In particular, in characteristic zero the above definition is equivalent to Definition 5.

Lemma 16. *Suppose that D is a numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X and $\pi\colon Y \to X$ is any regular alteration. For any Weil divisor E on Y, we have*

$$\mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor D \rfloor) \cdot \pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(E) \subseteq \pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(\lfloor E + \pi_{\text{num}}^* D \rfloor).$$

Proof. We are free to assume that X is affine. Suppose we have global sections of $\mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor D \rfloor)$ and $\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(E)$, *i.e.* we have $f \in K(X) \subseteq K(Y)$ with $\operatorname{div}_X(f) + D \geq 0$ and $g \in K(Y)$ with $\operatorname{div}_Y(g) + E \geq 0$. Since $\operatorname{div}_Y(f) + \pi_{\text{num}}^* D$ is π-trivial as $\operatorname{div}_Y(f) = \pi^* \operatorname{div}_X(f)$ and also $\pi_* \left(\operatorname{div}_Y(f) + \pi_{\text{num}}^* D\right) = \operatorname{div}_X(f) + D \geq 0$, the Negativity Lemma once again implies that $\operatorname{div}_Y(f) + \pi_{\text{num}}^* D \geq 0$. It follows that $\operatorname{div}_Y(fg) + E + \pi_{\text{num}}^* D \geq 0$ and so $f \cdot g$ is a global section of $\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(\lfloor E + \pi_{\text{num}}^* D \rfloor)$ as desired. □

Proposition 17. *Suppose that X is a normal variety over an algebraically closed field of positive characteristic. Let Z be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X so that $K_X + Z$ is numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, and $\pi\colon Y \to X$ a regular alteration. Then*

$$\tau(X, Z) \subseteq \operatorname{Tr}_\pi \left(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(\lceil K_Y - \pi_{\text{num}}^*(K_X + Z) \rceil)\right)$$

where $\operatorname{Tr}_\pi\colon \pi_* \omega_Y \to \omega_X$ is the corresponding trace map.

Proof. The statement is local, so we are free to assume X is affine. Let

$$J = \operatorname{Tr}_\pi \left(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(\lceil K_Y - \pi_{\text{num}}^*(K_X + Z) \rceil)\right) = \operatorname{Tr}_\pi \left(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \lfloor \pi_{\text{num}}^*(K_X + Z) \rfloor)\right).$$

It is clear that J is a fractional ideal sheaf: furthermore, using that X is normal, we may verify $J \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X$ by checking on the smooth locus of X where $K_X + Z$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier. See [BST, Proposition 2.18] for a proof.

The conclusion follows if we can show $\phi(F_*^e J) \subseteq J$ for all $e > 0$ and all

$$\phi \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(\lceil (p^e - 1) Z \rceil), \mathcal{O}_X).$$

By use of duality for a finite morphism (see [BST]), using that both sheaves are reflexive, we have that

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}((F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(\lceil (p^e - 1) Z \rceil), \mathcal{O}_X) = F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor (1 - p^e)(K_X + Z) \rfloor) \cdot \langle \operatorname{Tr}_{F^e} \rangle$$

where the action on the right is premultiplication of the trace of Frobenius $\operatorname{Tr}_{F^e}\colon F_*^e \omega_X \to \omega_X$. Thus, we must show

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{F^e} \left(F_*^e (\mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor (1 - p^e)(K_X + Z) \rfloor) \cdot J)\right) \subseteq J. \tag{4.1}$$

To that end, using Lemma 16, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor (1 - p^e)(K_X + Z) \rfloor) \cdot J \\ &\subseteq \operatorname{Tr}_\pi \left(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \lfloor \pi_{\text{num}}^*(K_X + Z) \rfloor + \lfloor (1 - p^e) \pi_{\text{num}}^*(K_X + Z) \rfloor)\right) \\ &\subseteq \operatorname{Tr}_\pi \left(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - p^e \lfloor \pi_{\text{num}}^*(K_X + Z) \rfloor)\right) \end{aligned}$$

after verifying that for any $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D, $-\lfloor D \rfloor + \lfloor (1 - p^e) D \rfloor \leq -p^e \lfloor D \rfloor$. Equation (4.1) now follows using [BST, Proposition 2.18] and the functoriality of the trace map:

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{Tr}_{F^e} \left(F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor (1 - p^e)(K_X + Z) \rfloor) \cdot J\right) \\ &\subseteq \operatorname{Tr}_{F^e \circ \pi} \left(F_*^e \pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - p^e \lfloor \pi_{\text{num}}^*(K_X + Z) \rfloor)\right) \\ &\subseteq \operatorname{Tr}_\pi \left(\pi_* \left(\operatorname{Tr}_{F^e}(F_*^e \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - p^e \lfloor \pi_{\text{num}}^*(K_X + Z) \rfloor))\right)\right) \\ &\subseteq \operatorname{Tr}_\pi \left(\pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_Y - \lfloor \pi_{\text{num}}^*(K_X + Z) \rfloor) = J. \right. \end{aligned}$$

□

As above in characteristic zero, one may define a normal variety in positive characteristic to be *numerically* $\mathbb{Q}$*-Gorenstein* if the canonical class is numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier. However, given a model of a numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein variety X in characteristic zero over a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}$-algebra A, it is unclear whether X_μ remains (geometrically) numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein for an open subset of closed points $\mu \in \operatorname{Spec} A$. Said another way, given the behavior of nefness in families (*cf.* [Lan, Les]), it is unclear if numerical pull-back can be preserved after reduction to positive characteristic. In a sense, this is the difficulty which must be avoided in proving Theorem 1, as otherwise one could use Proposition 17 in order to verify (3.1).

Given the main results of [BST, BSTZ10], it would seem natural to ask the following questions.

Question 18. Suppose that X is a numerically $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein variety over an algebraically closed field of positive characteristic.

(a) Is it true that $\tau(X) = \operatorname{Tr}_\pi(\pi_*\mathcal{O}_Y(\lceil K_Y - \pi^*_{\mathrm{num}} K_X \rceil))$ for all sufficiently large regular alterations $\pi\colon Y \to X$? More generally, can one find an alteration that achieves equality in Proposition 17?

(b) Suppose, in addition, that X is strongly F-regular, and let Z be a $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor on X. Are the F-jumping numbers of the test ideals $\tau(X, \lambda Z)$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ a discrete set of rational numbers? In particular, is the F-pure threshold of (X, Z) rational?

References

[BST] Manuel Blickle, Karl Schwede, and Kevin Tucker, *F-singularities via alterations*. To appear in Amer. J. Math., arXiv:1107.3807. ↑1, 6, 9, 10

[BSTZ10] Manuel Blickle, Karl Schwede, Shunsuke Takagi, and Wenliang Zhang, *Discreteness and rationality of F-jumping numbers on singular varieties*, Math. Ann. **347** (2010), no. 4, 917–949. ↑10

[BdFF12] Sebastien Boucksom, Tommaso de Fernex, and Charles Favre, *The volume of an isolated singularity*, Duke Math. J. **161** (2012), no. 8, 1455–1520. ↑1, 2, 3, 8

[BdFFU] Sebastien Boucksom, Tommaso de Fernex, Charles Favre, and Stefano Urbinati, *Valuation spaces and multiplier ideals on singular varieties*. To appear in the London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series, volume in honor of Rob Lazarsfeld's 60th birthday, arXiv:1307.0227. ↑1, 3, 4, 8

[dFH09] Tommaso de Fernex and Christopher D. Hacon, *Singularities on normal varieties*, Compos. Math. **145** (2009), no. 2, 393–414. ↑1, 2, 3

[dJ96] A. J. de Jong, *Smoothness, semi-stability and alterations*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **83** (1996), 51–93. ↑8

[Har01] Nobuo Hara, *Geometric interpretation of tight closure and test ideals*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **353** (2001), no. 5, 1885–1906 (electronic). ↑1, 2, 4

[KM98] János Kollár and Shigefumi Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 134, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. With the collaboration of C. H. Clemens and A. Corti; Translated from the 1998 Japanese original. ↑6, 7, 8

[HH99] Melvin Hochster and Craig Huneke, *Tight closure in equal characteristic zero*, Preprint (1999). ↑4

[Lan] Adrian Langer, *On positivity and semistability of vector bundles in finite and mixed characteristics*. To appear in J. Ramanujan Math. Soc., arXiv:1301.4450. ↑10

[Les] John Lesieutre, *The diminished base locus is not always closed*. Submitted, arXiv:1212.37380. ↑10

[MS11] Mircea Mustaţă and Vasudevan Srinivas, *Ordinary varieties and the comparison between multiplier ideals and test ideals*, Nagoya Math. J. **204** (2011), 125–157. ↑1, 4

[Sch11] Karl Schwede, *Test ideals in non-$\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **363** (2011), no. 11, 5925–5941. ↑2, 4, 5

[Smi00] Karen E. Smith, *The multiplier ideal is a universal test ideal*, Comm. Algebra **28** (2000), no. 12, 5915–5929. Special issue in honor of Robin Hartshorne. ↑1, 2, 4

[Tak04] Shunsuke Takagi, *An interpretation of multiplier ideals via tight closure*, J. Algebraic Geom. **13** (2004), no. 2, 393–415. ↑1, 2, 5, 6

Department of Mathematics, University of Utah, 155 South 1400 East, Salt Lake City, UT 48112-0090, USA
E-mail address: defernex@math.utah.edu

Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Rua Mário Santos Braga, s/n, 24020-140 Niterói, RJ, Brasil
E-mail address: roi@mat.uff.br

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, the University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan.
E-mail address: stakagi@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Department of Mathematics, Statistics, and Computer Science, University of Illinois at Chicago, 851 S. Morgan Street, Chicago, IL 60607-7045, USA
E-mail address: kftucker@uic.edu